



0000075743

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION)
OF PINAL COUNTY, ARIZONA TO)
UPGRADE A CROSSING OF THE UNION)
PACIFIC RAILROAD AT GANTZEL ROAD))
IN PINAL COUNTY, ARIZONA,)
AAR/DOT NO. 176-281-Y.)

DOCKET NO.
RR-03639A-07-0334

EVIDENTIARY
HEARING

At: Phoenix, Arizona
Date: August 2, 2007
Filed: AUG -8 2007

RECEIVED
2007 AUG -8 P 1:01
AZ CORP COMMISSION
DOCKET CONTROL

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Arizona Corporation Commission
DOCKETED

AUG -8 2007

DOCKETED BY *nr*

ARIZONA REPORTING SERVICE, INC.
Court Reporting
Suite 502
2200 North Central Avenue
Phoenix, Arizona 85004-1481

Prepared for:

By: Kate E. Baumgarth, RPR
Certified Reporter
Certificate No. 50582

ACC

ORIGINAL

**FOR
INTERNAL
&
INTERAGENCY
USE
ONLY**

Pursuant to the contract with Arizona Reporting Service all transcripts are available electronically for internal agency use only.

Do not copy, forward or transmit outside the Arizona Corporation Commission.

1 INDEX TO EXAMINATIONS

2 WITNESSES PAGE

3

4 ALBERT JOHN BLAHA

5 Direct Examination by Mr. Johnson 6

Cross-Examination by Mr. Hains 14

6 Examination by ALJ Stern 15

7

8 CHRIS WATSON

9 Direct Examination by Hains 16

Cross-Examination by Mr. Johnson 19

10 Examination by ALJ Stern 22

11

12

13

14 INDEX TO EXHIBITS

15 NO. DESCRIPTION IDENTIFIED ADMITTED

16 S-1 Staff report 7 13

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 BE IT REMEMBERED that the above-entitled and
2 numbered matter came on regularly to be heard before the
3 Arizona Corporation Commission, in Hearing Room 1 of said
4 Commission, 1200 West Washington Street, Phoenix, Arizona,
5 commencing at 9:30 o'clock a.m., on the 2nd day of August,
6 2007.

7

8 BEFORE: MARC STERN, Administrative Law Judge

9 APPEARANCES:

10

11 For the Arizona Corporation Commission Staff:

12 Mr. Charles Hains
13 Staff Attorney, Legal Division
14 1200 West Washington Street
15 Phoenix, Arizona 85007

16 For the Applicant:

17 OFFICE OF THE PINAL COUNTY ATTORNEY
18 By Mr. Glenn C. Johnson
19 P.O. Box 887
20 Florence, Arizona 85232

21

22 For Union Pacific Railroad:

23 BEAUGUREAU, ZUKOWSKI, HANCOCK, STOLL &
24 SCHWARTZ, P.C.
25 By Terrance L. Sims
302 East Coronado
Phoenix, Arizona 85004

26

27 KATE E. BAUMGARTH, RPR
28 Certified Reporter
29 Certificate No. 50582

30

1 ALJ STERN: Okay. This hearing is now open in
2 the matter of the application of Pinal County Arizona to
3 upgrade a crossing of the Union Pacific Railroad at
4 Gantzel Road in Pinal County, Arizona AAR/DOT
5 No. 176-281-Y.

6 My name is Marc Stern. I will preside over this
7 proceeding. The docket number is RR-03639A-07-0334.

8 At this time I will take appearances. And on
9 behalf of the County, since you are present today?

10 MR. JOHNSON: Yes. My name is Glenn Johnson and
11 I am from the Pinal County Attorney's Office on behalf of
12 the County. With me is A.J. Blaha, the assistant public
13 works director. He will be the witness for the County.

14 ALJ STERN: All right. And on behalf of
15 Commission Staff I have?

16 MR. HAINS: Thank you. Good morning, Your Honor.
17 Charles Hains on behalf of the Safety Division of the
18 Commission.

19 ALJ STERN: All right. I have the Commission
20 Staff memorandum, and that will be Exhibit S-1?

21 MR. HAINS: That's correct.

22 ALJ STERN: Okay. Does the County have any
23 exhibits you are going to admit?

24 MR. JOHNSON: We have had two exhibits marked.

25 ALJ STERN: If they are not

1 eight-and-a-half-by-eleven, I cannot take them.

2 MR. JOHNSON: We brought them for your benefit,
3 if you need them. They will be used during Mr. Blaha's
4 testimony, but they are a little larger than that.

5 ALJ STERN: Okay. It's not a problem.

6 All right. Mr. Johnson, do you have any opening
7 comments that you want to make at all?

8 MR. JOHNSON: I will waive them at this time.

9 I believe Mr. Watson will be going forward first.

10 ALJ STERN: Mr. Hains, do you have any opening
11 statement at all?

12 MR. HAINS: Thank you, Your Honor. I have none.

13 ALJ STERN: Okay. Do you want to call
14 Mr. Watson?

15 MR. HAINS: Yes, but first I had a quick
16 question. I believe the representative from the railroad
17 is here. I think he had public comment that he wanted to
18 make.

19 ALJ STERN: Mr. Sims, did you want to make any
20 comments or actually want to enter an appearance today?

21 MR. SIMS: Your Honor, my only purpose in being
22 here is to state the Union Pacific's response to the
23 application, which is that -- my understanding is that
24 with the original design plan Union Pacific Railroad
25 expressed some concerns about, but those were addressed in

1 the final design. At this point Union Pacific has no
2 objection to the application submitted by Pinal County.

3 ALJ STERN: Okay. Thank you.

4 MR. JOHNSON: Your Honor, I do believe, and
5 hopefully the record will reflect, that all the notice
6 provisions in the procedural order have been complied
7 with -- notice to one municipality --

8 ALJ STERN: Yes, sir. I saw the filing from the
9 County. I think Mr. Hartman filed that with the
10 Commission about July 8, so we are set for notice.

11 Okay. Ready with any witnesses?

12 MR. HAINS: Yes. Thank you, Your Honor. Staff
13 would like to call Mr. Chris Watson to the stand.

14 ALJ STERN: Come forward and be sworn in.

15

16

CHRIS WATSON,

17 called as a witness herein by Staff, having been first
18 duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

19

20

DIRECT EXAMINATION

21

22 BY MR. HAINS:

23 Q. Good morning, Mr. Watson. How are you doing
24 today?

25 A. Good morning. Thank you.

1 Q. Please give your full name and place of business
2 for the record.

3 A. My name is Chris Watson. I work for the Arizona
4 Corporation Commission Grade Railroad Safety Section.

5 Q. And could you briefly explain your position and
6 your duties in that position?

7 A. I am the grade crossing inspector for the State
8 of Arizona. I oversee all the grade crossing applications
9 for the State of Arizona as well as surface issues and
10 that sort of thing.

11 Q. And in the performance of your duties were you
12 assigned to evaluate the current application?

13 A. I was.

14 Q. And do you have up there what has been labeled as
15 Exhibit S-1?

16 A. I do.

17 Q. And could you identify that for the record
18 please?

19 A. S-1 is the Staff memorandum that I prepared for
20 this case.

21 Q. And if you were asked to or called upon to
22 discuss the same material discussed in the Staff report,
23 would your answers be essentially the same today?

24 A. They would.

25 Q. And do you adopt the Staff report as your sworn

1 testimony today?

2 A. I do.

3 Q. Do you have any changes, additions or
4 modifications that you would like to make to the Staff
5 report?

6 A. I do not.

7 Q. Mr. Watson, I would briefly like to discuss with
8 you the nature of the crossing.

9 Could you describe the location for me, please?

10 A. Location is in Pinal County close to the town of
11 Queen Creek Railroad 943.85, north and south roads. To
12 the north of the crossing is Riggs about 1.6 miles. To
13 the south is Bella Vista Road, which is 3.4 miles, I
14 believe.

15 Q. Thank you. And could you describe the nature of
16 the upgrade that is being requested in this application?

17 A. Pinal County plans to widen the road from two
18 lanes to four lanes. It's my understanding it's already
19 been widened around the two-lane railroad crossing, and
20 they are now ready to go forward and widen that railroad
21 crossing from two lanes to four lanes.

22 Q. And would you describe the safety features, what
23 will be used at the upgrade?

24 A. There are currently lights and gates at this
25 crossing. They will be upgrading it to 12-inch LED

1 lights, new cantilevers, new gate arms and new concrete
2 surface.

3 Q And are you aware of how much traffic there
4 currently is being experienced in that location now?

5 A Yeah. The last data request that we sent out,
6 Pinal County sent back average daily traffic counts for
7 17,000 cars per day -- vehicles per day, and that was
8 taken in June of 2006.

9 Q And what does that translate to in terms of the
10 level of service?

11 A Level of service right now is Level Service C.
12 They anticipate Level Service B will be achieved with
13 upgrade to the four lanes.

14 Q And a Level Service C, however, it is still
15 considered an operable intersection, I believe?

16 A My understanding of the level of service from
17 AASHTO, the American Association of State Highways and
18 Transportation Officials, that a Level Service C is still
19 an acceptable level of services.

20 Q And the level of service will improve with the
21 expansion of the road project that they are describing?

22 A That is what they are telling me.

23 Q Is it forecasted that at some point in the future
24 the level of service may still revert back to or perhaps
25 even become worse than it is presently, though?

1 A. They are projecting within ten years it still
2 being a Level Service C, which is still acceptable.

3 Q. I see.

4 Now, based on the extensive traffic and any other
5 criteria that Staff considers in a crossing upgrade, would
6 you say that this crossing upgrade, the modifications that
7 are being requested in this application, are consistent
8 with similar crossings of the same nature?

9 A. They are.

10 Q. I would like to move on to costs.

11 Are you aware of how much the anticipated
12 crossing is going cost?

13 A. \$570,000.

14 Q. And do you know how it is going to be allocated?

15 A. Pinal County is paying for the entire project.

16 Q. Okay. Does Staff believe this is consistent with
17 the public interest?

18 A. I do.

19 Q. And you said this was also all County of Pinal
20 money; it was not any state or federal money?

21 A. No.

22 Q. Moving on to grade separation, I believe you
23 mentioned inside your Staff report that there is some
24 anticipation that there is a potential, eventual need to
25 grade separate this crossing in the future; is that

1 correct?

2 A. That's correct. It's my understanding Pinal
3 County intends in the next five to ten years to widen the
4 road again from four to six lanes. And in the responses
5 to my data requests they said that they will look at the
6 grade separation within that five to ten years for this
7 particular area.

8 Q. And to your knowledge, do you know if this
9 anticipated need for grade separation is driven by high
10 number of train volume per day or is this simply a
11 recognition that there is an intersection here between an
12 infrequently used piece of rail with a large intersection?

13 A. I don't believe the number of trains is a big
14 factor at this particular crossing. They are between,
15 from railroad records that were sent in, six to eight per
16 day, which is not a high number of trains. Speed is a
17 concern, 60 miles per hour at that particular crossing.

18 But I think the bigger concern is the amount of
19 traffic through there will be significantly raised in the
20 next five or ten years.

21 Q. And has the County provided any explanation why
22 they would not like to separate the crossing at this
23 point?

24 A. No, they noted several reasons, which I noted in
25 the Staff report.

1 There was already an existing crossing there.
2 They just needed to widen it to conform to the
3 road-widening project. The amount of right-of-way that
4 would be needed to buy in order to get the grade
5 separation would be tremendous. And they also cited the
6 rail traffic was light, which we talked about, and would
7 not be a safety concern in their minds.

8 *Q.* And did Staff look at any other criteria to
9 distinguish whether it would be appropriate to grade
10 separate at this point in time?

11 *A.* Staff started looking at a priority exposure
12 index type of thing. We took it from a report, Grade
13 Separation, When to Report. It's the product of the
14 number of trains and average daily traffic. We plug those
15 numbers in, and it came out at 119,000.

16 The exposure index is by no means an all
17 encompassing tool. It's kind of a quick reference that we
18 have started using. We are not sure if we will continue
19 to use it, but anything over 100,000 in the report says to
20 maybe consider looking now or in the future grade
21 separation.

22 *Q.* But it doesn't spell out like a crisis threshold
23 or anything like that?

24 *A.* No, it does not.

25 *Q.* So it --

1 A. It's a very basic kind of guideline.

2 Q. I see.

3 And based on your evaluation using that index, as
4 well as the reasons that the County provides, does Staff
5 agree that it is not necessary to grade separate at this
6 time?

7 A. At this time Staff agrees with that, with the
8 idea that within the next five to ten years Pinal County
9 does look at grade separating.

10 Q. Does Staff have any specific recommendation with
11 regard to how Pinal County should be looking at when -- or
12 like is there a specific threshold they should be looking
13 at when they should be seriously considering grade
14 separation?

15 A. We don't have a threshold or a guideline at this
16 time. It is something we are looking at, but I can't for
17 100 percent answer that right now.

18 MR. HAINS: Okay. Thank you.

19 Your Honor, Staff would like to move for the
20 entry of Exhibit S-1 into evidence at this time.

21 ALJ STERN: Any objections to the admission of
22 Exhibit 1, the Staff report?

23 MR. JOHNSON: No, Your Honor.

24 ALJ STERN: No objections. Exhibit S-1 is hereby
25 admitted.

1 MR. HAINS: And thank you, Your Honor. And
2 Mr. Watson is now available for questions.

3 ALJ STERN: All right. Mr. Johnson, any
4 questions for the witness?

5 MR. JOHNSON: Very briefly.

6

7

CROSS-EXAMINATION

8

9 BY MR. JOHNSON:

10 Q. Pinal County staff -- Public Works staff was
11 cooperative in giving you the data you needed for your
12 report.

13 Would that be a correct statement?

14 A. Correct, very helpful.

15 Q. And they have indicated that at the appropriate
16 time they would consider grade separation?

17 A. Yes, they have.

18 Q. Do you have any information as to what a
19 separated grade crossing would cost at this time?

20 A. The number they gave me would be around
21 \$40 million.

22 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you very much. I have
23 nothing further, Your Honor.

24 ALJ STERN: All right.

25

1

EXAMINATION

2

3 BY ALJ STERN:

4 Q Mr. Watson, we referred to the matter earlier a
5 little bit. Mr. Johnson, I believe, inquired whether
6 Staff had received notification from the County that
7 proper notice had been given.

8 Did Staff and the Commission receive
9 certification of notice prudent to the terms of the
10 procedure order?

11 A Yes, we did, Your Honor.

12 Q And did it comply in that notice was published
13 and also sent to affected parties?

14 A Yes, it was.

15 Q Okay. And with respect to this crossing, who
16 will be maintaining the crossing area and crossing surface
17 after the upgrade is completed?

18 A The Union Pacific will be maintaining the
19 railroad part of the crossing, warning devices and
20 crossing surface.

21 Q And you want the Union Pacific to notify you
22 again of when the project starts and when it concludes?

23 A That would be wonderful.

24 Q And there is no State funding going into this
25 project at all, is there?

1 A. No.

2 ALJ STERN: I don't have any more questions.

3 Any redirect?

4 MR. HAINS: No.

5 ALJ STERN: Thank you, Mr. Watson. You are
6 excused.

7 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

8 ALJ STERN: All right. Mr. Johnson, do you want
9 to call Mr. Blaha?

10 MR. JOHNSON: Yes, I would.

11

12

ALBERT JOHN BLAHA,

13 called as a witness herein by the Applicant, having been
14 first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

15

16

DIRECT EXAMINATION

17

18 BY MR. JOHNSON:

19 Q. Would you state your full name and occupation for
20 the record, please.

21 A. My name is Albert John Blaha. I'm the deputy
22 public works director for Pinal County.

23 Q. And what is your relationship to this particular
24 project?

25 A. I manage the engineering branch. We are

1 responsible for the design and construction of the road
2 projects within Pinal County. I oversee this project.

3 Q Did you bring some diagrams with you today?

4 A Yes, sir.

5 ALJ STERN: In we can sort of use that table over
6 there or that little door, that gate if you want to lean
7 it on something.

8 THE WITNESS: This was just to clarify. This is
9 a blow-up from our small area transportation study map.
10 It shows all of our future recently significant routes,
11 and we just want to show the relationship of this
12 Ganzel/Ironwood project.

13 If I could go over here --

14 Q BY MR. JOHNSON: This is part of a larger project
15 or roadway project?

16 A That's correct.

17 It would be easier if I hold it here.

18 The project starts down here on Hunt Highway and
19 will continue all the way up to State Route 60 dividing a
20 two-lane road to a four-lane divided road, putting in
21 traffic signals.

22 We are already 90 percent complete with that
23 project with the exception for the railroad crossing and
24 the bridge on the CAP canal. It's about a \$92 million
25 project.

1 As you know from newspaper articles, there is a
2 huge growth spurt going on down here in the Johnson Ranch
3 and San Tan area of Pinal County. And the population well
4 exceeds the ability for people to drive out of that area.

5 So we have to provide a route out of that area
6 until we can get a route to expand some existing routes,
7 particularly Hunt Highway. We started design on widening
8 of Hunt Highway, and once we can divert traffic, we will
9 go to Hunt Highway with new construction.

10 Also on this map is a large blue swath that goes
11 through here through Pinal County. This is the ADOT's
12 north/south corridor for a future freeway.

13 Q. Why is that significant to this proceeding?

14 A. Well, this has been adopted by the ADOT
15 Transportation Board already last year. And if this
16 freeway goes in, our modeling of the road network within
17 Pinal County shows that we probably can expect a
18 50 percent reduction in the traffic on Ironwood and Ganzel
19 because then most people will get on the freeway system.

20 So we agreed to look at the possibility of a
21 grade separating crossing here. We will evaluate it in
22 five years if the population growth continues or if this
23 freeway project does not happen, we will be looking at a
24 grade separating crossing and expanding the Ganzel project
25 to six lanes.

1 If this freeway project does go forward, our
2 growth patterns don't continue at the same rate they are
3 now, there may not be the need to.

4 Traffic projections that we predict were based on
5 this continuing population growth. We have already seen a
6 slowdown. New home permits have gone from 1,000 a month
7 to 1500 to 500 a month this year. So we expect to see
8 some scaling back on that.

9 That is the only reason why I brought this map,
10 to show you the whole picture.

11 ALJ STERN: Thank you.

12 Any other questions, sir?

13 MR. JOHNSON: I don't believe so.

14 ALJ STERN: Mr. Hains, any questions for the
15 witness?

16 MR. HAINS: Thank you, Your Honor. Just a few.

17

18

CROSS-EXAMINATION

19

20 BY MR. HAINS:

21 Q. Good morning. How are you doing?

22 A. Great.

23 Q. I just want to make sure I am saying your name
24 right. Is it Blaha?

25 A. Blaha.

1 Q Blaha?

2 A Blaha with an L.

3 Q Blaha. Okay. Thank you.

4 Mr. Blaha, first you discuss that you will be
5 looking at the populations, the growth as one of the bases
6 for how you are going to determine if there is going to be
7 a need for grade separation in this area; is that correct?

8 A Yes, in a roundabout way.

9 We actually will be doing traffic counts. We
10 watch the population and building permit numbers, but
11 traffic counts is basically -- every year we do traffic
12 counts to see how traffic has increased on roads and see
13 if we need to do improvements.

14 Q So you had said the population growth is more
15 like a peripheral way of looking at it in a big sense and
16 the traffic counts would be the specific thresholds that
17 you are looking for?

18 A Correct.

19 Q And I believe this is going to be -- you are
20 looking at a total of six lanes for Ganzel at some point;
21 is that correct?

22 A That's correct.

23 Q And it's anticipated to be a major arterial at
24 that point?

25 A That's correct.

1 Q Are there any other thresholds that the County is
2 looking at in terms of how to determine whether or not
3 to -- well, actually I will take the question back. You
4 already answered that in the population threshold
5 question.

6 When the County decided to pay the full \$570,000,
7 did the County look at any other means of paying for the
8 project?

9 A No, we didn't at that time. No.

10 Q How do you anticipate paying for the project?
11 Assuming that if you were to grade separate it, how do you
12 anticipate paying for the project?

13 A We would have to incorporate grade separate
14 crossings into some of our other fee structures, like
15 impact fees. The County just implemented impact fees this
16 year. We did not have grade separated structures in that
17 fee, transportation fee. So that would have to be
18 incorporated into it.

19 Q So you don't have a funding for it if it were to
20 be done for it now anyway?

21 A That's correct.

22 Q Thank you. That's all the questions -- I guess
23 one -- no, never mind. Thank you.

24 MR. HAINS: That's all.

25 ALJ STERN: I have a couple.

1

EXAMINATION

2

3 BY ALJ STERN:

4 Q Mr. Blaha, that diagram or that map that you had,
5 that photo, the Ganzel Road runs east/west; is that
6 correct?

7 A Actually, Your Honor, it runs north/south.

8 Q North/south?

9 A Yes.

10 Q Okay.

11 A And the reason you have several names for it is
12 it moves over to the west and connects to what was the
13 Ironwood alignment. So to the north it's on the Ironwood
14 alignment and to the south it's on Ganzel. That is why we
15 refer to it with two names.

16 Q Oh, I see.

17 You say Ironwood is to the south?

18 A Ironwood is the portion to the north.

19 Q And Ganzel is to the south?

20 A Yes. That's correct, Your Honor.

21 Q Okay. Could you just refer to that diagram
22 again? Maybe hold it up for a minute.

23 Now, where is Ganzel Road -- Ganzel/Ironwood
24 Road?

25 A This reddish line like this.

1 Q I see.

2 A This is like State Route 60 by Apache Junction.

3 Q Okay. So it runs north and south.

4 Now, where is the crossing itself? In that, the
5 little red square?

6 A Right. And the railroad runs diagonally from
7 southeast to northwest.

8 Q Okay. And where is Riggs Road from --

9 A I have to pull my glasses out.

10 Riggs Road is the first east/west road right
11 here. On this map it's named Combs. In Pinal County
12 Riggs Road is called Combs, C-o-m-b-s.

13 Q It's Combs in Pinal County?

14 A Yes.

15 Q That runs east and west?

16 A Yes, Your Honor.

17 Q And Bella Vista Road, does that have any other
18 name in Pinal County?

19 A No.

20 Q Okay.

21 A No, Your Honor.

22 Q That is an easy one?

23 A Yes.

24 Q And that runs east and west also?

25 A Correct. That is right here.

1 Q. And that is south of the where the crossing is?

2 A. Yes, Your Honor. Here's the crossing right here,
3 and this is Bella Vista right here.

4 Q. I see.

5 A. This is Riggs Road right here.

6 Q. And the County in order fund this particular
7 upgrade, the \$540,000, what is the source of your funds
8 for that?

9 A. We are using it out of the funding that we
10 required for the Ironwood/Ganzel project, which we
11 basically got a GADA loan to do that. We are paying it
12 back out of our transportation funds.

13 Q. G-A-T-A?

14 A. G-A-D-A.

15 Q. What is that --

16 A. I believe that is --

17 Q. -- if you know?

18 A. The government --

19 MR. JOHNSON: It's a special funding source. I
20 don't know what the acronym is, Your Honor. It's a
21 special funding source provided by the State of Arizona
22 bonding. It provides collateral for bonding.

23 Q. BY ALJ STERN: But the total cost of that
24 Ganzel/Ironwood project is approximately \$92 million?

25 A. That's correct, Your Honor.

1 Q. That is the entire upgrade?

2 A. That's correct, Your Honor, a 17-and-a-half-mile
3 route.

4 Q. And both you and the Railroad are ready to go on
5 with this upgrade; correct?

6 A. Yes, Your Honor.

7 Q. You have already paved both sides --

8 A. Yes, we have widened it on both sides of the
9 road.

10 Q. And the County will take a look at the need for a
11 possible grade separation in the future if the traffic
12 counts merits it?

13 A. Yes, Your Honor, or if the railroad traffic was
14 to increase significantly, either one.

15 Q. The roadway that you referred to earlier, does
16 that have a particular highway number associated with it
17 or anything at that point? Is it on a north/south
18 highway?

19 A. Are you talking about Ironwood/Ganzel?

20 Q. No, the one ADOT is planning.

21 A. It's referred to in the ADOT plan as the
22 north/south corridor.

23 Q. But they haven't given it a number or anything?

24 A. No, Your Honor. It hasn't gotten that far.

25 Q. How far out is the projected construction for

1 that?

2 A. They have not put it on their five-year plan, so
3 it's not within the next five years.

4 ALJ STERN: Okay. I don't think I have any other
5 questions for you. Thank you.

6 Any redirect?

7 MR. JOHNSON: No, Your Honor.

8 ALJ STERN: Thank you.

9 Any other witnesses?

10 MR. JOHNSON: No. We will rest, Your Honor.

11 ALJ STERN: Okay. Mr. Hains, anything?

12 MR. HAINS: I have no closing except that Staff
13 believes that this is in the public interest --

14 ALJ STERN: All right.

15 MR. HAINS: -- and it has met our approval.

16 ALJ STERN: All right. Mr. Johnson, I am sure
17 your client would like to have this approved yesterday;
18 correct?

19 MR. JOHNSON: Or sooner.

20 ALJ STERN: We will try to get it on -- I don't
21 know if we can get it on the next open meeting. I think
22 we may be past our deadline, but we will be looking for --
23 it might still be able to get on the next open meeting. I
24 will see.

25 MR. JOHNSON: If that were possible, that would

1 be great.

2 ALJ STERN: If not, we will be on September for
3 sure.

4 Thank you for your time. That concludes today's
5 proceeding.

6 MR. HAINS: Thank you, Your Honor.

7 (Whereupon, the hearing concluded at 10:02 a.m.)

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 STATE OF ARIZONA.)
) ss.
 2 COUNTY OF MARICOPA)

3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
 10
 11
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25

I, KATE E. BAUMGARTH, RPR, Certified Reporter
 No. 50582, for the State of Arizona, do hereby certify
 that the foregoing printed pages constitute a full, and
 accurate transcript of the proceedings had in the
 foregoing matter, all done to the best of my skill and
 ability.

WITNESS my hand this 7th day of
August, 2007.


 Kate E. Baumgarth, RPR
 Certified Reporter, No. 50582